## Remarks.

The Examiner has indicated that **claim 14** is allowable.

1/and 2/ Claims 1, 3-13 have been rejected under 35 USC 112 second paragraph as being indefinite

More particularly, the Examiner has stated that claim 1 relates to a "snap lock device" alone.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite "A combination snap lock device, extension and downspout".

Accordingly, Applicant is of the opinion that modified claim 1 is definite and that the rejection thereof under S 112 has been overcome by such amendment.

3/ and 4/ Claims 1 and 3-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. S 103(a) as being unpatentable over US. Pat. No. 5,846,040 to UENO

**US. Patent No. 5,846,040 to UENO** shows a snap lock device having a first member 10 having a head 11 and a shank 12 which extends through holes H1, H2 of members P1 and P2.

In the present invention, as defined in modified claim 1, an important feature is the provision of a

combined snap lock device, extension and downspout which permits a reliable hinging of the extension to the downspout. The combination is of simple and inexpensive construction. Modified claim 1 includes all of the claim limitations and further novel and non obvious features of claims 3-13.

Accordingly, Applicant is of the opinion that the teaching of the '040 reference does not disclose the aforementioned important combination of features of modified claim 1 and should therefore be allowable over the cited '040 reference.

5/. Claims 1, 6-8 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. S 103(a) as being unpatentable over US. Pat. No. 5,975,820 to Kirchen.

US. Pat. No. 5,975,820 to Kirchen discloses a relatively complex snap lock fastener which requires as shown in Fig. 5 thereof, a channel 302 for the reception therein of the portion 14 of the fastener. Also, the element 200 is not captured between the element 50 as shown in Fig. 4 and the head 26. More particularly, the element 200 is disposed on the opposite side of the head 26 relative to the channel 302 as shown in Fig. 5. Therefore, such an arrangement as disclosed in the '820 arrangement is entirely different from the invention as claimed in modified claim 1 and as exemplified in Fig. 2 of the subject application.

Accordingly, Applicant is of the opinion that the teaching of the '820 reference does not disclose the aforementioned important novel and non obvious combination of features of modified claim

1 and should therefore be allowable thereover.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the claim as amended is requested.

By this amendment, claim 1 has been modified to emphasize important features of the present invention. Claims 3-13 have been cancelled. Claims 1 and 14 remain in this application.

Allowance of claims 1 and 14 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

David J. Archer.

Applicant's representative.

Lavis J. Al

Reg No 31,076.